DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 830 EA 009 070

AUTHOR Sandercock, James M.
TITLE The Development and Implementation of a Program of Open Campus.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 76
NOTE 79p.; Maxi I--Maxi II Practicum Report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Doctor of Education Degree, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Attendance; *Discipline; Models; Objectives; Parent Attitudes; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Scheduling; School Vandalism; Senior High Schools; Student Attitudes; Students; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Lower Merion School District PA; *Open Campus

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to develop and implement a workable program of open campus for the Harriton High School of Lower Merion, Pennsylvania. The first phase of the practicum defined needs and shortcomings, defined objectives, developed a model program of open campus, and evaluated this program. In the second phase of the practicum, a refined program was implemented into the school and the open campus program was evaluated. The evaluation indicated that the model program was successful in terms of fostering student self-discipline and an atmosphere conducive to academic achievement. Also, subsystems related to the program of open campus--attendance, discipline--improved under the program developed. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133830

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAM OF OPEN CAMPUS

by

JAMES M. SANDERCOCK

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

Bucks County Cluster
H. James Ross, Coordinator

Practicum Report:
Maxi I - Maxi II
June 30, 1976

EA 009 070

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... i

INTRODUCTION..... ii

PRACTICUM REPORT

Background Information..... 1

Defining Shortcomings and Assessing Needs..... 4

Review of other open campus programs and policies..... 5

Meetings focusing on improvement of open campus program..... 11

Codification of recorded data..... 18

Report on attendance data..... 19

Report on discipline..... 19

Report on vandalism..... 21

Report on academic achievement..... 21

Defining Objectives..... 23

Developing a Model Program of Open Campus..... 25

Reviewing and Modifying the First Semester Model of Open Campus..... 31

Evaluation of the Model Programs of Open Campus..... 35

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations... 44

(more)

Table of Contents
(continued)

Appendices

Appendix A - Diagnosing Professional Climates of Schools..... 48

Appendix B - Staff Questionnaire on Policies Relating to Open Campus..... 51

Appendix C - Poll of Sophomore Opinion on Open Campus..... 53

Appendix D - Harriton High School Philosophy and Objectives..... 55

Appendix E - Questionnaire on the Open Campus Policy and Its Effect on Student Deportment and Atmosphere for Learning - 1st Semester - 1975-1976..... 59

Appendix F - Questionnaire on the Open Campus Policy and Its Effect on Student Deportment and Atmosphere for Learning - 2nd Semester - 1975-1976..... 61

Appendix G - Comparative Results of Questionnaires on Open Campus - Student..... 63

Appendix H - Comparative Results of Questionnaires on Open Campus - Parent..... 66

Appendix I - Comparative Results of Questionnaires on Open Campus - Teacher..... 69

Bibliography..... 72

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to develop and implement a workable program of open campus for the Harriton High School of Lower Merion. The first phase of the practicum defined needs and shortcomings, defined objectives, developed a model program of open campus, and evaluated this program. In the second phase of the practicum, a refined program was implemented into the school, and the open campus program generally was evaluated. The evaluation indicated that the model program was successful in terms of fostering student self-discipline and an atmosphere conducive to academic achievement. Also, sub-systems related to the program of open campus--attendance, discipline--improved under the program developed.

INTRODUCTION

In January, 1971, a policy of open campus was introduced into the Harriton High School. Within a period of three years the open campus arrangement began to show evidence of shortcomings in areas of class and school attendance, tardiness, and general campus discipline including human relations. Disruptive incidents during the 1973-1974 school year led to increased concerns and to this practicum effort. The practicum effort was to develop and implement a workable program of open campus at Harriton High School.

The practicum report begins with detailed background information leading to the time period of the practicum. The report then describes the activities of the first year and one-half of the practicum (the Maxi I phase of the practicum). Reported are the efforts to define shortcomings and assess needs. This definition and assessment led to a defining of objectives and a developing of a model program of open campus. The model program of open campus was implemented into the Harriton High School during the first semester of the 1975-1976 school year.

Introduction
(continued)

This model program was reviewed and modified, and a refined program of open campus was inserted into the school during the second semester of the 1975-1976 school year. During this Maxi II phase of the practicum, the programs of open campus were evaluated through review at meetings, through questionnaires administered to students, parents, and teachers, and through analysis of data about attendance, discipline, vandalism, and academic achievement. The effort to develop and implement a program of open campus was found to be generally successful.

A final section of the report presents statements of conclusion and summary and recommendations.

A set of appendices contains complete results of various questionnaires used and a statement of the school's philosophy and objectives. A bibliography lists the references used in the report.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAM OF OPEN CAMPUS

by

JAMES M. SANDERCOCK[1]

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In January, 1971, after a brief lessening of the custodial role of the school (senior study halls, open campus at the beginning and end of the school day for seniors with study hall assignments), the school began to operate on a policy of "open campus". Under this policy students with parent permission needed to be on campus only when scheduled for a class or other activity. The open campus was based on the philosophy that the school should operate with a minimum of regulations, that rules should be adopted for the majority of students, and that the ultimate goal would be a student body characterized by self-discipline.

The implementation of the open campus policy

---

[1]James M. Sandercock: Principal of Harriton High School of Lower Merion, Lower Merion School District, Ardmore, Pennsylvania. Harriton High School is a 900 pupil public high school serving grades 10, 11, and 12.

had several immediate effects. Initially, the tensions of the late sixties and early seventies in the school--resulting from anti-war sentiment, racial conflict, problems resulting from a no-smoking policy, and vandalism--were immediately diffused. The custodial role of the school in general and of the classroom teacher in particular was lessened. And, the classroom teacher immediately enjoyed increased amounts of unassigned time. (There was a noticeable use of this time in individual teacher-pupil conferences.)

Although on questionnaires the open campus policy never received overwhelming support (in June of 1971, fifty percent of the parents supported the policy, forty-three percent opposed the policy, and seven percent did not form an opinion), virtually no parents denied permission for their child to participate in the program. Students overwhelmingly favored and still favor the open campus policy.[2]

However, within a period of three years, the open

---

[2]School Opinion Questionnaires of June, 1971, and May, 1974.

campus arrangement began to show evidence of shortcomings. Class and school attendance, tardiness, and general campus discipline all came under increasing scrutiny in the School District. A generally high absentee rate in the school persisted. This rate has been especially high for the students with the poorest academic achievement.[3] Class cutting and tardiness increased partially in that students involved in activities simply were tardy or opted to cut a class rather than return to school and be tardy.

During the 1973-1974 school year a series of widely publicized disruptive student incidents at the other high school in the School District also focused additional attention on the open campus policy. Groups of adults believed that the same potentially disruptive elements existed at Harriton High School. The concerns expressed involved how

---

[3]Since the open campus policy has been in effect through June, 1974, the average number of days of absence per pupil in the school was between seventeen and eighteen days. The Practitioner of the National Association of Secondary School Principals reports health officials' estimates of a normal absentee rate of seven to nine days of absence for each student (assuming a school year of 180 days).

students were using unassigned time, human relations and particularly racial relations, vandalism, and drug abuse.

Thus, this set of information led to this practicum effort--to develop and implement a workable program of open campus at Harriton High School.

Note: The Maxi I Phase of the Practicum spanned the the time period, August, 1974, through January, 1976.

DEFINING SHORTCOMINGS AND ASSESSING NEEDS

The first step in the development of a model open campus program was a formal defining of shortcomings and an assessing of needs. This effort included a review from a national perspective of other open campus programs and practices, a general solicitation of opinions and reactions toward open campus, faculty inservice sessions focusing on aspects of the open campus policy particularly human relations, and a general codification of basic recorded information about attendance, disciplinary, and academic matters.

Review of Other Open Campus Programs and Policies

In the process of defining shortcomings and assessing needs, it was felt important to review other programs of open campus found in other high schools in the United States. Reported here are elements of programs that were considered in developing and implementing a program of open campus for Harriton High School.

Open Campus in Massachusetts:

Between the years of 1970 and 1973, eighty-three open campus high schools were certified to operate in Massachusetts. The goal of the Massachusetts program was to allow high school students to make significate decisions about educational matters that shape their lives. The hope was that students would in their unassigned time enroll in mini courses, use special facilities such as language laboratories and libraries, engage in independent study, and participate in structured and unstructured activity outside the school. the primary obligation was to respect the rights of others both on and off school grounds. All students

were eligible to participate.[4]

Open Campus at Belle Fourche High School:

Belle Fourche High School found that the open campus did not generally determine the number of students participating in extra curricular activities. Prior to open campus, it had been believed that many students once joined an activity to avoid a study hall. Under the open campus policy, where students no longer had to join an activity to avoid study hall, there was not a decline in extra curricular activity participation.[5]

Implications of Open Campus Design--Cotton:

The Executive Assistant Director of the Division of Health Services, Sciences, and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, states that functions of student control and containment have generally been overemphasized leading to inefficient use of the

---

[4]Gregory C. Coffin, "The Open Campus, and How It Swept Massachusetts", Education Summary, 3, April 14 and 28, 1972.

[5]Louis Graslie, "Five Years of Open Campus", NASSP Bulletin, 369, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1973, 76-78.

instructional staff. Further, many disciplinary rules, which were intended to clarify how students are to behave, generally have served to generate more rules. These rules too often have led to increased efforts to monitor and control student behavior and often to student resentment. The writer advocates open campus in an effort to erase the often petty and senseless rules, to reduce strain on facilities by not merely holding students, to provide training in use of leisure, and to produce an atmosphere with fewer conflicts and more trust.

He points out, however, that open campus requires increased attention to matters of size of faculty, new teacher assignments, the concept of "in loco parentis", utilization of facilities, informal curriculum, and student discipline.[6]

Open Campus Evaluation--Boston High School:

Goals and objectives for a flexible campus program for Boston High School were stated as follows:

---

[6]Oscar Cotton, "Some Implications of the Open Campus Design", APSS Know How, 24, New York, Columbia University Press, 1972, 1, 6-7.

1. To create an educational atmosphere that encourages students to become more self-directing and self-disciplining
2. To improve the climate for learning
3. To improve student attitudes toward school
4. To develop in each student the ability to carry out independent work and study projects
5. To provide students with the opportunity to make greater use of resources within the school and those resources in the community
6. To better utilize the talents of faculty members
7. To utilize existing classroom spaces more effectively
8. To provide increased numbers of alternative learning options for students
9. To improve interpersonal relationships between students and faculty
10. To reduce the degree of custodial responsibilities that schools have assumed. [7]

Areas in which deficiencies existed were outlined as follows:

-lack of clerical help

-insufficient involvement of teachers

-insufficient orientation for students

-insufficient parent communication

---

[7] John S. Gibson, Evaluation of the 1971-1972 Boston High School Flexible Campus Program, Medford, Massachusetts, The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, 1972, 7-8.

-institutions of higher learning generally not contributing opportunities to students
-too few opportunities to relate the need for better human understanding and demonstrate human relations. [8]

Self-directed Day at Niles East High School:

An evaluation of changes in student attitudes and student behavior under an open campus plan at Niles East High School found that:

-students spend a high percentage of non-class time engaged in personal activities
-classroom attendance improved slightly under the program
-violations of school rules and regulations declined substantially under the program [9]

Open Campus at Interlake Senior High School:

A comprehensive evaluation of the open campus program at Interlake Senior High School revealed

---

[8] Ibid., 25-27.

[9] Robert Roth, "A Systematic Evaluation of the Self-directed School Day at Niles East High School, Skokie, Illinois", Dissertation Abstracts International, December, 1971.

a successful program with no major problems. The evaluation focused on five areas and conclusions:

-Effect on school expenditures? Drop in cafeteria receipts.

-Effect on academic performance? Academic performance up slightly.

-Effect on attendance? Attendance improved.

-Effect on job of staff? No general effect on staff workload.

-Effect on community? Seventy-five percent of business community favored program.[10]

Open Campus High Schools--Focus on Principals:

A study examined high schools and their principals in the State of Connecticut for the purpose of determining the relationships between their custodial or humanistic orientations and principals' personal variables, their schools' characteristics, and the social context of their school communities.

The findings of the study revealed that principals

---

[10]Donald L. Mickey and Lawrence E. Bryan, An Evaluation of the Open Campus Policy at Interlake Senior High School, Washington, Bellevue Public Schools, 1972.

with the following characteristics showed the greatest tendency to favor an open campus and operate schools with open campus practices:

-Open-minded

-Localistic viewpoint (rather than cosmopolitan)

-Younger

-Head schools with smaller student enrollments

-Head schools with white populations

-Head non-city schools

-Head schools with families who have higher median incomes [11]

The research and review on open campus programs to date is not extensive. The above represents information that was studied in the process of defining shortcomings and assessing needs in an effort to develop and implement a program of open campus at Harriton High School.

Meetings Focusing on Improvement of Open Campus Program

In an effort to deal with problems felt to be

---

[11] Oscar Cotton, "Open Campus High Schools: Principals' Perceptions and Practices in the State of Connecticut," Dissertation Abstracts International, May,, 1973.

closely related to the open campus program, various meetings were held during the 1974-1975 school year. These meetings dealt with matters peripheral to the open campus program--human relations, school discipline, attendance, and general academic concerns.

In response generally to the series of disruptive incidents at Lower Merion High School, the other high school in the District, the Board of School Directors had approved regulations which modified the open campus program for the 1974-1975 school year in both high schools. The regulations established a minimum number of classes to be assigned for each student; denied sophomores open campus during their first semester in the school; withdrew open campus from students who received suspensions from school, failing grades on quarterly reports, or unexcused absences from scheduled activities. These regulations were implemented despite objections from the Harriton High School administration to the treatment of sophomores and the nature of the penalties. The regulations and the Harriton administration's concern about the regulations gave impetus to the practicum effort to

develop and implement for the 1975-1976 school year a workable program of open campus. The meetings described in this section of the report were important to the development of the model programs.

Early in the 1974-1975 school year in response to student concern about the new open campus regulations, an assembly was scheduled to permit students to hear from and interact with the Superintendent of Schools and a representative from the Board of School Directors who were responsible for the new regulations. At this assembly the Board member presented the background information that led to the Board's decisions. Student questions--which revealed a depth of ill feeling toward the regulations--focused on why students were not involved in a decision needed because of behavior in another school, the timing of the decision (announced over the summer vacation), and the injustice of treating one class (sophomores) different from others. Student questions also revealed a lack of knowledge on the part of students of what a school board is and how it functions--a lack of knowledge about governance of a school.

The secondary school principals in the District also scheduled a meeting with parents from the black community and officials from the Soul Shack, a black community social-educational organization. The blacks at this meeting expressed concerns about the open campus policy primarily in terms of academic achievement. Many felt that the past open campus policies fostered class cutting which was detrimental to students and particularly to black students.

In November, 1974, a meeting of the Human Relations Committee of the Board of School Directors and the administrators from the high schools was held. The meeting reviewed the opening of the school year and reactions to school policies. Conclusions from the meeting were: a) continue to hold regular parent information meetings even if the meetings were not productive--to insure a channel of communication, b) search for an alternative to restricting sophomores for an entire semester, c) consider programs for students on the governance of the schools.

The three inservice sessions conducted for the Harriton High School faculty during the 1974-1975

school year dealt with some aspect of human relations. The matter of human relations in each event was related to the open campus program.

The October, 1974, Inservice Day focused on communications and the amount of influence appropriately held by school related groups. Communications skills presented to teachers were to be usable with students.

Prior to the inservice session the professional staff at Harriton completed a questionnaire revealing their opinions about the amount of influence in determining educational matters that is held and ought to be held by various groups. The questionnaire generally revealed (See Appendix A, Page 48) that the Harriton High School professional staff felt that the Board of School Directors and the Superintendent of Schools held the most influence and that influence more appropriately should be held by the teachers in general and by the principal.

The January, 1975, Inservice Day offered a half day of general human relations programs presented by the local education association (NEA affiliate)

and a half day focusing on human relations aspects of current policies in operation at Harriton High School. To gain information for discussion purposes at the meeting, a questionnaire on school procedures that effected the open campus program was distributed and completed. The results of this questionnaire (See Appendix B, Page 51) indicated that the faculty believed that students failing courses should be removed from the open campus program, that restricting certain students from open campus improved the campus atmosphere, and that assignment to study halls reduced class cutting.

The February, 1975, Inservice Day provided the opportunity for faculty to react as individuals and as a group to simulated situations that contained various human relations dimensions; many of the situations were drawn from incidents relating to the open campus program. Among the results of this activity was the awareness of the need for faculty to react consistently in handling student matters.

In addition to the meetings on open campus, a poll of sophomore opinion on open campus was taken

in May, 1975. The poll revealed (See Appendix C, Page 53) general discontent with open campus rules and a strong support for treating sophomores as other classes.

The primary conclusions drawn from the solicitation of opinion and meetings held to discuss matters peripheral to the program of open campus were:

-There is an overwhelming need to involve students in matters that involve them directly, such as the program of open campus; the timing of announcement of decisions must be made to allow for student reaction.

-If students within an institution are going to be treated differently (e.g., sophomores being treated differently from juniors and seniors), there must be a clearly understood educational rationale for this treatment.

-Students need to be aware of the authority structure and operational procedures involved in the governance of a school.

-The black community in this situation favored regulations that assured class attendance.

-There needs to be a channel of communication that allows for regular face-to-face communication with parents.

-The faculty of Harriton High School felt the need for more influence exercised by the building level faculty and the principal.

-Faculty support existed for open campus regulations which limited participation in the program by students who have failing grades and who cut classes.

-There is a need for consistency by faculty in enforcing general campus regulations.

General Codification of Recorded Data on Attendance, Discipline, Vandalism, Academic Matters

A major portion of the practicum was to organize data about attendance, discipline, vandalism, and academic matters that would be valuable for evaluating the program of open campus and other school programs. An important aspect of this organizing was to systematize the collecting procedures so that data would be available on an on-going basis. The data were and will be used to create a greater awareness of these

matters and trends in these matters. The nature of the data to be collected and the procedures for collecting the data have been incorporated into the Harriton High School Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures. The data is presented in this section as a report of a separate part of the practicum and will be analyzed as part of the evaluation of the model program of open campus.

Report on attendance data:

Attendance for School Year 1973-1974-

Number of Pupils - 923
Number of Days Absent - 17,272
Average Days Absent Per Pupil - 18.7

Attendance for School Year 1974-1975-

Number of Pupils - 925
Number of Days Absent - 14,868.5
Average Days Absent Per Pupil - 16.07

Attendance for School Year 1975-1976-

Number of Pupils - 929
Number of Days Absent - 13,929
Average Days Absent Per Pupil - 14.99

Report on discipline:

As part of the practicum, disciplinary data were studied for a period of three school year--1973-1974,

1974-1975, and 1975-1976. The results for these school years are reported here; analysis of the results will be accomplished as part of the total evaluation of open campus.

The following recording-reporting system has been developed for use on an on-going basis. A file folder is maintained for each student seen by an administrator. Into this folder is placed a record of the date the student was seen, the nature of the problem, and the disposition of the matter. For purposes of developing comparative data for the practicum, disciplinary action resulting in a cut (unexcused absence from a scheduled curricular activity) and in suspension from school were tallied.

School Year 1973-1974:

Cuts - 679
Suspensions from school - 68 days

School Year 1974-1975:

Cuts - 939
Suspensions from school - 115 days

School Year 1975-1976:

Cuts - 510
Suspensions from school - 94 days

Report on vandalism:

The open campus program allows students access to all areas of the campus--a complex of four separate buildings on fifty-eight acres of land. For purposes of developing comparative data for the practicum, acts of vandalism were studied. Acts of vandalism were considered to be items which were determined to be non-accidental for which a Repair Requisition needed to be written. Again, this data will be analyzed as part of the overall evaluation.

School Year 1973-1974:

Acts of Vandalism - 55

School Year 1974-1975:

Acts of Vandalism - 62

School Year 1975-1976:

Acts of Vandalism - 52

Report on academic achievement:

To obtain comparative data on academic achievement, a twenty percent sample of students in the Class of 1976 was studied. Students were selected randomly from groups of stanines of the Stanford Achievement Test administered in the fall of 1974 as follows:

Stanine	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
9 8 7	18	30
6 5	9	15
4 3	9	15
2 1	24	40

The grade point average of these for the 1974-1975 school year was compared to the grade point average for the 1975-1976 school year.

	1974-1975 Grade Point Average	1975-1976 Grade Point Average
Students in Stanines 9, 8, 7	3.39	3.38
Students in Stanines 6, 5	2.84	3.26
Students in Stanines 4, 3	2.23	2.76
Students in Stanines 2, 1	2.16	2.56
Total Average for all students	2.65	2.99

DEFINING OBJECTIVES

In defining objectives for the program of open campus, it was determined that the program must fall within the school's statement of "Philosophy and Objectives"--a statement redefined and updated for the 1974-1975 school year. (See Appendix D, Page 55). This statement placed strong emphasis on a student-oriented school, self-discipline, respect for the individuality of others, responsible work habits and constructive use of leisure time, and rapport and respect among members of the school community.[12]

The defining of objectives was a cooperative effort involving directly administrative and teaching staff and indirectly students and parents. The defining process considered input from other open campus programs, results of meetings on open campus, and opinions expressed on various questionnaires.

The primary objectives were to develop and operate a program of open campus that encouraged

---

[12]Harriton High School, Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures, 1975-1976, Rosemont, Pennsylvania, 6-8.

self-discipline and that created conditions conducive to learning. These objectives were evaluated in part through a questionnaire administered to students, parents, and teachers at the beginning of the period of trying out the model open campus program and then again during the period of implementation of the modified model. The questionnaire results were used in an attempt to express quantitatively qualitative responses of randomly selected students, teachers, and parents. Significance of change was a deviation of ten percent or more on a particular item.

In addition, the program of open campus was to foster a positive rate of class and school attendance as compared to the original years of the open campus program. The rate of student absence should approach a rate of absence of seven to nine days of absence for each student (assuming a school year of 180 days), as estimated to be normal by health officials.[13]

The revised program of open campus to be successful

---

[13]NASSP, The Practioner, op. cit.

was also to reduce the incidents of student misbehavior (generally class cutting and behavior leading to suspension from school) and vandalism from the original years of the open campus program--a twenty percent reduction being significant.

Further, in a successful open campus program, academic achievement, as reflected in academic grades earned, should not be diminished, and, preferably, should improve.

DEVELOPING A MODEL PROGRAM OF OPEN CAMPUS

The following model open campus program was implemented during the first semester of the 1975-1976 school year (September, 1975, through January, 1976).

Policy Concerning Open Campus:

> Senior high school students are required to be in five assigned classes or activities on a regular basis with exceptions to be approved only by the principal. School officials should offer a choice of ways for senior high school students to spend their non-instructional time. Study halls should be provided. But students should also have access to areas for recreation and areas for research and study.
>
> Senior high school students shall have the right

to spend their non-instructional time in a manner of their own choosing, as long as such use does not interfere with the operation of the school, provided in each academic year: 1) prior written consent of a student's parent or guardian is obtained; 2) that right shall be withdrawn upon the withdrawal of written consent of the student's parent or guardian; 3) that right shall be forfeited by academic failure in one major or two minor subjects in the preceding quarter, failure to meet student responsibilities of regular classroom attendance, or failure to conform to school rules and regulations; 4) that right shall be withdrawn by school officials in order to protect the safety and welfare of students and the school when conditions on the campus are judged to warrant such withdrawal, notwithstanding any prohibitions against group or retroactive punishment for offenses of known or unknown individuals. This right shall not commence for students new to the high school until they shall have received a complete program of orientation as to all pertinent policies, rules and regulations of the district and the school, and of the rights and responsibilities pertaining to and expected of students. It is anticipated that this orientation period will extend for a period of approximately two weeks after the start of the semester.

Unexcused Absence, Class Cutting, Cutting of Assigned Activities:

Class cutting and cutting of any other assigned activity are not permitted. The following action will be taken concerning students who cut:

First illegal absence:

1) Parents will be notified
2) Open campus will removed for a period of nine weeks.

Second illegal absence:

1) Assistant Principal will notify and, if necessary, arrange a conference with the student, parents, and possibly counselor and teacher involved

2) Open campus will be removed for the remainder of the school year.

Third illegal absence:

1) Student will be suspended for three days
2) Parents will be informed and will be asked to appear in school to have the student reinstated.

More than three illegal absences may result in consideration for referral for more serious disciplinary action.

General Rules Concerning Open Campus:

1) Students who are suspended from school during the second semester of a school year, who cut classes during the last three weeks of the school year, or who drop failing from a course during the last three weeks of the course will be denied open campus during the first nine weeks of the subsequent school year.
2) Major subjects are those that earn one credit for thirty-six weeks of work or or one-half credit for eighteen weeks of work. Courses that earn less than this amount--physical education and driver education--are considered minor subjects.
3) Any student suspended from school may be denied open campus for a period of nine weeks with the first offense. Open campus will be denied for the remainder of the school year for the second offense. [14]

* * * *

To provide orientation about open campus and

---

[14] Harriton High School, Student Guide, 1975-1976, Rosemont, Pennsylvania, 6,7.

other related matters to all students new to the school (all sophomores and students new to the School District), these students were placed into a supervised study for a two week period during which time they received a program of orientation. The orientation program:

Session 1 - This session was held the day before school opened and consisted of the regular transportation run, a preview of the opening weeks' activities, and a tour of the buildings and campus.

Session 2 - At this special assembly for students new to the school, the open campus policy--history, supporting philosophy, current procedures, supporting sub-systems--were explained in detail.

Session 3 - At an assembly for the students new to the school, there was an explanation of the functions of the Board of School Directors and the responsibilities of the District and building administrative staffs. Basic services and procedures of the following were explained: Parent-Faculty Association, Instructional Materials Center,

Health Suite, Attendance Office, and Guidance Office. The co-curricular activity program was outlined.

Session 4 - The final assembly allowed for a full explanation of Guidance Services--counseling assignments, course selection and change-of-course procedures, career counseling, personal counseling. There was a brief focus on study skills.

Two supportive systems were developed to support the open campus program--daily telephone contact to absentees and administrative contact within a twenty-four hour period with all students who allegedly cut a scheduled class or activity.

Parent volunteers were recruited to contact by school telephone the homes of all absent students on a daily basis. The parent volunteers were to call each afternoon from the day's absentee list.

A considerable effort in terms of administrative time was made to have administrative contact within a twenty-four hour period with all students who allegedly cut a scheduled class or activity. An extensive procedure

which has been included in the Harriton High School Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures was developed. Teachers report students absent from class on the Class Attendance Sheet. The attendance secretary then removes the names of legitimately absent students (as verified by the telephone check) or other students who are excused for some other reason. A file card is then prepared by the secretary for all unaccounted absences; the card includes student's name, class or activity missed, and teacher name. The student's schedule card and discipline file (if any) are pulled by the close of the school day. The next morning at the beginning a class period, a secretary calls by school intercom telephone the students to the Assistant Principal's Office. The absence is then discussed, and a determination of whether or not the student cut class is made. The teacher is notified of the nature of the absence--excused or unexcused. If the student has cut, he or she is assigned the appropriate punishment, and the file card with action indicated is placed into the student's disciplinary file. The Assistant Principal schedules the student into study hall and returns the scheduling card to the Guidance Office

through the guidance counselor so that the counselor is apprised of the action taken and can arrange follow-up counseling, if appropriate.

Note: The Maxi II Phase of the practicum spanned the time period January, 1976, through June, 1976.

REVIEWING AND MODIFYING THE FIRST SEMESTER MODEL PROGRAM OF OPEN CAMPUS

The procedures of the model open campus program implemented during the first semester of the 1975-1976 school year were subject to on-going evaluation during the semester. The evaluation took place mainly at regular meetings of the groups that establish Harriton High School's primary sources of communication and policy development--the Student Caucus, the Principal's Advisory Council (consisting of building administrators), the Faculty-Administrative Council, the General Faculty, and the Parent-Faculty Association. A number of changes were made in the model open campus program, and these changes were implemented during the second semester of the 1975-1976 school year. The changes:

-It was found to be impossible to contact all

absentees on a daily basis. Repeated malfunctions and comparatively limited access of a newly installed telephone system and irregular reporting to school by parent volunteers hindered the calling procedure. The procedure was modified so that only students designated by the Assistant Principal and a random selection from the balance of the absentees were called.

-The close check of attendance conducted as part of the model open campus program revealed patterns of high absenteeism among a relatively small percentage of students. Direct action was introduced to insure that parents would be aware of the attendance patterns and would monitor the situation. A letter expressing the school's concern about the unusual number of absences from school was sent to parents of any student who missed fifteen or more days of school. After twenty days of absence, students were required to provide the school a letter of excusal from a medical doctor. The letter of concern and the requirement of the doctor's excuse (tested and found to be a legal procedure), improved

the school attendance of this group of students. -The "General Rules of Open Campus" (See Page 27 of this report) were modified primarily to simplify students' understanding of the rules and administrative recordkeeping and to permit some administrative discretion in administering the program particularly in denying students open campus. The revised General Rules are:

1) Any student suspended from school may be denied open campus for a period of nine weeks with the first offense. Open campus may be denied for the remainder of of the school yea. for the second offense.
2) Students who drop failing from a course during the last three weeks of the course will be denied open campus during the first nine weeks of the subsequent school year.
3) Major subjects are those that earn one credit for thirty-six weeks of work or one-half credit for eighteen weeks of work. Courses that earn less than this amount--driver education and physical education--are considered minor subjects. [15]

---

[15] These rules were operating policy for the second semester of the 1975-1976 school year. The rules will be included in the Harriton High School Student Guide when it is revised in August, 1976.

-Library procedures as they effected students on on open campus were found to be overly restrictive. The library procedures were:

- The librarian will designate the number of students permitted to come to the library from each supervised study during a particular class. These students are to report to the library at the beginning of a class period, Students coming to the library from a supervised study must submit to the librarian a pass from the supervised study teacher.
- Students on open campus are permitted to use the library as space permits. These students may report to the library at any time during the period.
- All students who enter the library during a a particular period must remain for the entire period. [16]

These procedures were modified so that students on open campus could use the library on a come-and-go-freely basis as they did during previous school years. However, students coming to the library from supervised study were required to remain in the library for the entire period. Attendance was taken in the library at varying times during the period, and study hall students not present in the library when attendance was taken lost the library privilege and were considered to be cutting.[17]

---

[16] Harriton High School, Student Guide, op. cit., 20.

[17] These procedures will be included in the Student Guide when it is revised in August, 1976.

-In response to faculty concerns about consistency in supervised study decorum it was decided as a matter of policy that study halls should be conducted in a manner resulting in an atmosphere conducive to individual study.

The refined open campus model which included the above five matters was inserted into the school for the second semester of the 1975-1976 school year.

EVALUATION OF THE MODEL PROGRAM OF OPEN CAMPUS

In addition to on-going evaluation of policy and procedural matters of the program of open campus through information shared at regular meetings, the evaluation of specific aspects of the program was conducted. These specific aspects were evaluated through analysis of results of an open campus questionnaire administered on two occasions to students, parents, and teachers and through analysis of data gathered about sub-systems--attendance, discipline, vandalism, academic achievement--related to the program of open campus.

Open campus questionnaire:

The evaluative questionnaire (See Appendices E and F, Pages 59 & 61) consisted of twelve items dealing with six general areas--self-discipline, academic matters, counseling, human relations, attendance, and vandalism. The questionnaire used a five point Likert rating scale. The questionnaire results were an attempt to express quantitatively qualitative responses of randomly selected groups of students, parents, and teachers.

The questionnaire was administered early in the first semester of the 1975-1976 school year with directions for persons to respond to items from their initial knowledge of the policy to their knowledge at the time of their receiving the questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered a second time mid-way through the second semester of the 1975-1976 school year with directions for persons to respond to items from the view of how the program operated during the 1975-1976 school year.

The sample for each questionnaire consisted of sixty students (twenty sophomores, twenty juniors,

and twenty seniors--about seven percent of the student body), a like group of parents, and twenty classroom teachers (about thirty-three percent of the building's professional staff).

A ten percent or more deviation in results was the measurement for significance in change between questionnaires.

Analysis of questions on self-discipline. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). A primary objective of the program of open campus was to encourage student self-discipline. On both questionnaires students overwhelmingly indicated that the open campus policy provided considerable or complete opportunity for self-discipline (eighty percent on the first semester questionnaire and seventy-seven percent on the second semester questionnaire) and that students applied the concept of self-discipline provided by the policy (considerably or completely seventy-two percent and seventy percent respectively). The parent response to the question of the extent to which the open campus policy provides for self-discipline increased forty-seven percent in the categories of considerably more

and completely from the evaluation of the program pre-1975-1976 school year to the evaluation of the program during the 1975-1976 school year. About the same percentages of parents (forty percent and forty-seven percent) felt that students applied the concept of self-discipline. On the teacher questionnaires there was no significant change in views concerning the extent to which the policy provided for self-discipline and the extent to which the study body applied the concept of self-discipline. Question 3, the third question dealing with self-discipline, asked about the extent to which the open campus policy provided for the opportunity for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time. The response from students, parents, and teachers was generally positive and did not change significantly from one evaluation to the other.

Analysis of questions on academic matters. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). A second major objective of the program of open campus was to create conditions conducive to learning. In comparing points 3 and 4 on the Likert scale for question 4 which asked the extent to which the open

campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement, there was about a ten percent increase in the student response from the first questionnaire to the second. Parent and teacher response on these same points of question 4, however, decreased about ten percent from the first questionnaire to the second. (It should be noted, however, that there was a thirty percent increase on the second questionnaire in the percentage of teachers who felt that the open campus program fostered considerably more an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement.) Students, parents, and teachers expressed positive reactions on both questionnaires to questions about students getting extra help in a subject and taking advantage of getting extra help under the open campus policy. Student opinion increased about sixteen percent on points 3 and 4 of Question 6, although parent opinion decreased about thirteen percent on this same question about the extent to which students took advantage of extra help. For the 1975-1976 school year, there was a twenty-eight percent increase in the percentage of teachers who felt that students were taking advantage considerably more of getting

extra help in a subject under the open campus policy.

Counseling matters. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). Because an average of about twenty percent of the respondents indicated that the questions about counseling were "not applicable to my situation or not observed", analysis of these questions has not been included in this report.

Analysis of questions on human relations. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). On both questionnaires students indicated overwhelmingly that the open campus policy provided for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations (over fifty percent indicated completely) and, in fact, fostered a positive climate of human relations (over fifty percent completely). In considering points 3 and 4 on the Likert scale, there was a twelve percent increase from students for the 1975-1976 school year for the question that the policy fostered a positive climate of human relations. Likewise, on this same question 10 considering points 3 and 4, there was an eleven percent increase for the 1975-1976 school year in the parent response. The teacher questionnaire

for the 1975-1976 school year on question 9, the policy providing for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations, showed a twenty percent decrease on Likert scale points 3 and 4. (Sixty-four percent of the teachers, however, still felt that the program fostered completely or considerably more a positive climate of human relations.)

Analysis of question on attendance. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). In response to question 11 about the extent that the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance, the student questionnaire showed an increase of sixteen percent of student response stating that the policy did very little to foster a desirable rate of class attendance. The rating on the first questionnaire was more positive in response to fostering desirable rates of class attendance. The parent responses to this question showed no significant change. The teacher response, however, showed an increase on points 2 and 3 of the Likert scale for this question of thirty-six percent indicating a feeling that the open campus policy for the 1975-1976 school year fostered more desirable rates of class attendance.

Analysis of question on vandalism. (See Appendices G, H, and I, Pages 63, 66, & 69). Students indicated that they felt that vandalism did not increase under the 1975-1976 open campus policy. Over half the parents on both questionnaires indicated a response of "not applicable to my situation or not observed" to the valdalism question. Teachers indicated that they felt that there was an increase in vandalism but not a significant increase.

Data on sub-systems relating to the program of open campus:

Analysis of attendance data. The attendance data over a period of three school years indicate a lessening of the absence rate, although certainly not to the degree that the amount of absence would be considered a normal absentee rate of seven to nine days of absence for each student as estimated by health officials. The twenty percent reduction of the 1975-1976 rate of absence over the 1973-1974 rate of absence is at least encouraging and is, hopefully, an indication of a trend. Perhaps, if other factors, such as the actual reasons for absence had been considered--e.g., family vacations during the school year, students visiting colleges during the school year,

the rate of absence could be considered reduced even further. Also, sending letters of concern about of absence and requiring doctors' notes earlier in the school year might have reduced the rates of absence, also.

Analysis of data on discipline. The reduction in the number of class cuts for the 1975-1976 school year as compared to the previous two school years is significant. The reduction in the number of cuts from 1974-1975 to 1975-1976 is over forty-five percent. The reduction in the number of suspensions for this same period is over eighteen percent. It would appear that the efforts to check closely student class attendance as part of the program of open campus is highly desirable and productive. In addition, during the 1975-1976 program of open campus, fewer acts of vandalism occurred than during the two previous school years. A sixteen percent reduction in acts of vandalism occurred from 1974-1975 to 1975-1976.

Analysis of data on academic achievement. When grade point averages of a randomly selected group of students were compared over a two year period, the

grade point average of the group improved eleven percent. This improvement occurred from the 1974-1975 school year to the 1975-1976 school year.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The effort to develop and implement a program of open campus was generally successful. Evaluation indicated that the model and refined model programs of open campus better encouraged student self-discipline and better created conditions conducive to learning. Students, parents, and teachers on questionnaires indicated that the program provided for student self-discipline and that students were applying self-discipline. Students felt that the program of open campus fostered an atmosphere conducive to learning; parents and teachers expressed some reservation. However, a study of grade point averages indicated that academic achievement improved under the model and refined model programs of open campus.

Under the revised programs of open campus, sub-systems related to open campus also improved.

Students and parents saw the program of open campus providing for a possible positive climate of human relations and actually fostering positive human relations. A less positive teacher response to a possibility of a positive climate of human relations may, perhaps, be attributed to the teachers' becoming directly involved with students who because of violations of the open campus policy are placed into supervised study conducted by teachers. Further, study revealed that the rate of absence declined and that teachers felt that the modified open campus program fostered more desirable rates of class attendance. Instances of student class cutting and suspension from school as well as acts of vandalism were reduced under the modified program.

The practicum effort revealed the need for a) the development of clearly stated policies and procedures, b) extensive involvement of students, parents, teachers, and administrators at the building level in the making of these policies and procedures, and c) consistent enforcement of the policies and procedures.

Steps have been taken to institutionalize the following outcomes of the practicum. Statements of policy and procedures in the Student Guide and Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures have been modified.

-"General Rules of Open Campus" have been revised.
-Library regulations have been modified.
-A program on governance of school has been included in student orientation, also a new program.
-A procedure for maintaining data on attendance, discipline, vandalism, and academic achievement has been developed.
-A procedure for contacting immediately students who may have cut classes or other scheduled activities has been instituted.
-A procedure for using volunteers to call absentees has been formalized.
-Additional stress has been placed on the need for a positive record of school attendance through the sending of letters of concern and through requiring doctors' excuses.

Two recommendations for modification of the open campus program for the 1976-1977 school year are

recommended. It will be the responsibility of the building administration to implement these matters:

-There should be developed a program to publicize the improvement in student attendance and discipline and the reduction of acts of vandalism.

-Scheduling consideration should be given to distinguishing between assigning students to study hall as a punishment for discipline problems (e.g., cutting classes) and assigning students to study hall as encouragement to study (students who have failed a course).

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: DIAGNOSING PROFESSIONAL CLIMATES OF SCHOOLS

Part I. Harriton High School teachers were asked to indicate how much influence they thought the following groups or persons now have generally in determining educational matters (e.g., curriculum, policy) in Harriton High School.

The responses are indicated in terms of percentages.

	None	Little	Some	Considerable	A Great Deal
1. The local school board	0	2	4	24	70
2. Superintendent	0	2	11	48	39
3. Principal	2	11	55	28	4
4. You, yourself	20	55	18	5	2
5. A small group of teachers	9	59	30	2	0
6. Teachers in general	4	42	48	6	0
7. Curriculum personnel (Supervisor, director, coordinator)	2	18	59	21	5
8. Students	9	27	36	26	2
9. Parents	4	30	27	32	7
10. The teacher organization	13	25	55	5	2
11. Local colleges & universities	39	37	22	2	0

Appendix A (continued)

	None	Little	Some	Considerable	A Great Deal
12. Guidance & psychological services personnel	15	54	24	7	0
13. Newspapers	23	34	30	13	0
14. P.T.A.	24	21	26	11	0

Part II. Harriton High School teachers were then asked to indicate how much influence they thought these groups ought to have in determining educational matters in Harriton High School.

	None	Little	Some	Considerable	A Great Deal
1. The local school board	4	9	32	40	15
2. Superintendent	2	2	22	61	13
3. Principal	2	2	17	54	25
4. You, yourself	0	11	54	27	9
5. A small group of teachers	2	20	54	20	4
6. Teachers in general	0	2	22	52	24
7. Curriculum personnel (Supervisor, director, coordinator)	0	5	47	39	9
8. Students	2	28	53	17	0
9. Parents	7	20	51	17	5
10. The teacher organization	2	15	39	37	7

Appendix A (continued)

	None	Little	Some	Considerable	A Great Deal
11. Local colleges & universities	27	35	36	2	0
12. Guidance & psychological services personnel	5	50	36	17	2
13. Newspapers	45	44	11	0	0
14. P.T.A.	13	33	43	11	0

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE ON POLICIES RELATING TO OPEN CAMPUS

This poll was conducted for the Inservice Day, January 31, 1975.

The results are expressed in terms of percentages.

Part I: Study Halls

A. General Policies

1. Do you think sophomores should be assigned to study halls during free sets? Yes-55 No-45
   a. If so should they have study halls during all free sets? Yes-62 No-38
   b. If so, for the first semester only? Yes-50 No-50
   c. If so, for the entire year? Yes-62 No-38
2. Should students who fail a course be assigned to study halls? Yes-85 No-15
3. Should the penalty for misbehavior be study hall assignments? Yes-55 No-45
4. Do you now have or have you had a study hall assignment? Yes-68 No-32
   a. If so, do you find discipline in the study a problem? Yes-41 No-59
   b. If so, do students generally study in the study hall? Yes-48 No-52
   c. Do you think study halls should be segregated to differentiate among students who are assigned to study because they are sophomores, for behavior problems, or for a failing grade? Yes-64 No-36

Appendix B (continued)

5. Should there be standard regulations governing student behavior within a study hall?	Yes-83	No-17
B. Effects of Study Halls		
1. Have study halls improved the general campus atmosphere?	Yes-86	No-14
2. Have study halls improved classroom behavior?	Yes-26	No-74
3. Have study halls improved academic performance?	Yes-43	No-57
4. Have study halls reduced cutting?	Yes-84	No-16
5. Have study halls reduced tardiness?	Yes-48	No-52
6. Has the penalty of study halls for failing grades influenced you in your grading?	Yes-5	No-95
7. Has the penalty of study halls for cutting influenced you in pursuing students who cut?	Yes-27	No-73
8. Has the penalty of study halls for three tardinesses influenced you in pursuing students who are tardy?	Yes-29	No-71

Part II: Campus Supervision

A. Are you in favor of teachers being assigned to campus supervision?	Yes-68	No-32
B. Has the supervision improved general campus atmosphere?	Yes-84	No-16
C. Do you have or have you had campus supervision?	Yes-56	No-44

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF POLL OF SOPHOMORE OPINION
ON OPEN CAMPUS

This poll was conducted in May, 1975.

The results are expressed in terms of percentages.

	YES	NO	N.A.
1. Do you think that sophomores should have open campus during the first semester?	74	26	0
2. As a sophomore, do you feel unjustly singled out by being assigned to study halls during the first semester?	85	13	2
3. Did your placement in study halls make your adjustment to Harriton easier?	12	83	5
4. Were you able to study in study halls?	50	50	0
5. Did you study in study halls?	47	48	5
6. Has the study hall teacher reacted positively to study halls?	18	76	6
7. Should a student who fails one course be placed in study halls?	30	65	5
8. If you failed a course, did assignment to study halls help you to improve your grade?	3	28	68
9. Should suspended students be placed in study halls?	55	37	8
10. Should students who cut classes be placed in study halls?	50	45	5
11. Has the punishment of study halls kept you from cutting classes?	36	28	26

Appendix C (continued)

	YES	NO	N.A.
12. Should the same open campus policies apply to both Harriton and Lower Merion High Schools?	41	54	4
13. If the following alternatives to study halls were available to you, would you participate in:			
a. Tutoring sessions	57	42	1
b. Skills centers	50	50	0
c. Work crews on campus	29	71	0
d. Counseling sessions	42	50	8
e. Mini courses	65	28	7
14. Are you satisfied with the open campus rules of this year?	29	69	2

APPENDIX D

HARRITON HIGH SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

PHILOSOPHY

Preamble

Since our first statement on philosophy was written, critics of the American school have observed that the campus has changed from one of involvement to alienation and now, some say, to apathy. If we are to be sensitive to the needs of our students, we need a school that gives students a bearing, a place to try their fledging powers of expression, a caring school that gives respect and wins respect in turn, that encourages clear thinking and questioning, that strives for a curriculum of lasting value, that stresses the ideals of integrity, equality and community, and gives the assurance that individual effort does count--in short, a school where students can get re-involved.

Our campus has changed in many ways in the last few years. We have become less subject-oriented and more student-oriented. We are working towards a more open campus, in which discipline comes not only from administration and faculty, but also from the individual student.

We still have a way to go in making Harriton a school in which all students feel included. We wish to reach in a significant way as many students as possible. We recognize that the school years are most vital, and, in many respects, the most critical and formative in an individual's life--yet anxiety-producing for many in this time of transition from childhood to adulthood.

We are searching for a way.

Statement of Philosophy

The philosophy of Harriton High School is based

Appendix D (continued)

upon the belief that, to live effectively in this dynamic world, students must develop their capabilities as individuals and must learn to respect the individuality of others, while accepting themselves and others as members of various groups. Recognizing that Harriton exists in a community with strong academic interests, we assume the major responsibility for preparing our students to continue their formal education. Moreover, the school strives to serve all of its students by providing a flexible program designed to serve all of its students by providing a flexible program designed to offer opportunities for learning to every student, whatever his ability and ambition. Furthermore, we believe the community shares this responsibility.

The school shares with the family and community a concern for the growth of each student through the development of intellectual curiosity, physical health, emotional stability, an aesthetic sense, and a value system based on moral integrity and a social conscience. Believing that actions reflect attitudes, the school seeks to foster an understanding and appreciation of the past, a sense of freedom to experiment and be challenged in the present, and the conviction that learning should continue as an exciting and rewarding experience throughout life.

OBJECTIVES

In trying to implement its philosophical idea, Harriton strives to attain these objectives:

1. To offer a broad program, both curricular and extracurricular, that is sensitive to student need and interest.
2. To help each student develop his potential
   a. by gaining and utilizing basic knowledge and skills,
   b. by developing his ability to think logically, critically and creatively,

Appendix D (continued)

c. by learning to communicate effectively,
d. by learning to perceive the relationships among different subjects and the relevance of subject matter to life,
e. by developing responsible work habits and respect for the intrinsic value of good work, while encouraging creative and constructive use of leisure time,
f. by developing abilities and attitudes leading to worthwhile human relationships,
g. by encouraging the development of responsible leadership,
h. by preparing the student to become a productive member of society,
i. by encouraging an aesthetic awareness,
j. by learning to appreciate his own cultural heritage while recognizing and understanding the value of other cultures.

3. To foster rapport and respect among members of the school community.

4. To encourage students to utilize the many services of a culturally rich area.

5. To cultivate sound habits for growth towards mental, emotional and physical health

a. by encouraging students to recognize their capabilities as well as their limitations while striving for excellence,
b. by fostering recognition of the place of competition but striving to minimize its adverse effects,
c. by channeling energies into healthful and constructive pursuits requiring both individual effort and teamwork,
d. by helping students learn to act in a human way under pressure and cope with both success and failure.

6. To provide the opportunity for students to develop and test their individual values, within the framework of a school community.

7. To help students understand, practice and value the

Appendix D (continued)

democratic way of life

a. by demonstrating that the democratic way does work,
b. by fostering an attitude of respect for designated authority, realizing that authority may be constructively challenged,
c. by encouraging the individual to feel a concern and assume a responsibility for group activities and actions,
d. by providing opportunities for self-expression, while distinguishing between courageous non-conformity and irresponsible action.

8. To cultivate the attitude that man is the custodian rather than the exploiter of his earth.
9. To foster the desire for a higher educational level by providing guidance in choosing realistic goals and by helping each student realize that no educational need be considered terminal.

HARRITON HIGH SCHOOL

1st Semester 1975-1976

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE OPEN CAMPUS POLICY AND ITS EFFECT ON STUDENT DEPORTMENT AND ATMOSPHERE FOR LEARNING

You have been randomly selected to complete this questionnaire. Instructions: Please respond to this questionnaire from your own knowledge and experience with the Open Campus Policy--from your initial knowledge of the policy to the present time. Please return completed questionnaires to James Sandercock, Principal, Harriton High School.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Scale

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. Considerably more
4. Completely

NA. Not applicable to my situation or not observed

Person responding: (Please circle) Student Parent Teacher

	Please circle one
Self-discipline:	
1. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for self-discipline?	1 2 3 4 NA
2. To what extent does the student body apply this concept of self-discipline?	1 2 3 4 NA
3. To what extent does the open campus policy provide opportunities for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time?	1 2 3 4 NA
Academic matters:	
4. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement?	1 2 3 4 NA
5. To what extent may a student receive extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA
6. To what extent does the student take advantage of getting extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA

(Please turn over)

Scale

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. Considerably more
4. Completely

NA. Not applicable to my situation or not observed

	Please circle one
Extra counseling:	
7. To what extent may a student receive extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA
8. To what extent does the student take advantage of the opportunity for extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA
Human relations:	
9. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations?	1 2 3 4 NA
10. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered a positive climate of human relations?	1 2 3 4 NA
Attendance:	
11. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance?	1 2 3 4 NA
Vandalism:	
12. To what extent has the open campus policy and resultant use of non-classroom areas by students led to an increase in vandalism?	1 2 3 4 NA

HARRITON HIGH SCHOOL

2nd Semester 1975-1976

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE OPEN CAMPUS POLICY AND ITS EFFECT ON STUDENT DEPORTMENT AND ATMOSPHERE FOR LEARNING

You have been randomly selected to complete this questionnaire. Instructions: Please respond to this questionnaire from your own knowledge and experience with the Open Campus Policy. Please limit your response to your view of how the program operated during this school year--1975-1976. Please return completed questionnaires to James Sandercock, Principal, Harriton High School.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Scale

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. Considerably more
4. Completely

NA. Not applicable to my situation or not observed

Person responding: (Please circle) Student Parent Teacher

	Please circle one
Self-discipline:	
1. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for self-discipline?	1 2 3 4 NA
2. To what extend does the student body apply this concept of self-discipline?	1 2 3 4 NA
3. To what extent does the open campus policy provide opportunities for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time?	1 2 3 4 NA
Academic matters:	
4. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement?	1 2 3 4 NA
5. To what extent may a student receive extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA
6. To what extent does the student take advantage of getting extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1 2 3 4 NA

(please turn over)

Scale

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. Considerably more
4. Completely

NA. Not applicable to my situation or not observed

Please circle one

Extra counseling:

7. To what extent may a student receive extra counseling under the open campus policy? 1 2 3 4 NA

8. To what extent does the student take advantage of the opportunity for extra counseling under the open campus policy? 1 2 3 4 NA

Human relations:

9. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations? 1 2 3 4 NA

10. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered a positive climate of human relations? 1 2 3 4 NA

Attendance:

11. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance? 1 2 3 4 NA

Vandalism:

12. To what extent has the open campus policy and resultant use of non-classroom areas by students led to an increase in vandalism? 1 2 3 4 NA

APPENDIX G

COMPARATIVE RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES ON OPEN CAMPUS - STUDENT

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Number of Questionnaires Distributed		60	60
Number of Questionnaires Returned		36	40
Percentage of Return		60	66.6

The responses to the questions are expressed in terms of percentages.

Self-discipline:

1. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for self-discipline?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	14.0	20.0
	3. Considerably more	47.2	40.0
	4. Completely	33.3	37.5
	NA	5.5	2.5
2. To what extent does the student body apply this concept of self-discipline?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	25.0	22.5
	3. Considerably more	61.2	50.0
	4. Completely	11.1	20.0
	NA	2.7	7.5
3. To what extent does the open campus policy provide opportunities for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	8.3	10.0
	3. Considerably more	22.2	25.0
	4. Completely	69.5	65.0
	NA	0	0

Appendix G (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Academic matters:			
4. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement?	1. Not at all	5.5	0
	2. Very little	16.7	15.4
	3. Considerably more	55.6	71.8
	4. Completely	16.7	10.2
	NA	5.5	2.6
5. To what extent may a student receive extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	5.7	7.5
	3. Considerably more	48.6	27.5
	4. Completely	34.3	55.0
	NA	11.4	10.0
6. To what extent does the student take advantage of getting extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	32.2	20.0
	3. Considerably more	38.7	60.0
	4. Completely	13.0	7.5
	NA	16.1	12.5
Extra counseling:			
7. To what extent may a student receive extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	5.5	2.5
	2. Very little	11.1	15.0
	3. Considerably more	36.1	32.5
	4. Completely	33.3	45.0
	NA	13.7	5.0
8. To what extent does the student take advantage of the opportunity for extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	2.5
	2. Very little	22.2	27.5
	3. Considerably more	47.2	45.0
	4. Completely	11.1	20.0
	NA	19.5	5.0

Appendix G (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Human relations:			
9. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	2.7	5.0
	3. Considerably more	25.0	35.0
	4. Completely	72.3	55.0
	NA	0	0
10. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	2.7	0
	2. Very little	11.2	5.0
	3. Considerably more	27.8	40.0
	4. Completely	52.8	52.5
	NA	5.5	2.5
Attendance:			
11. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance?	1. Not at all	2.7	0
	2. Very little	19.4	35.0
	3. Considerably more	41.7	35.0
	4. Completely	19.5	17.5
	NA	16.7	12.5
Vandalism:			
12. To what extent has the open campus policy and resultant use of non-classroom areas by students led to an increase in vandalism?	1. Not at all	13.9	17.5
	2. Very little	58.3	40.0
	3. Considerably more	13.9	22.5
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	13.9	20.0

APPENDIX H

COMPARATIVE RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES
ON OPEN CAMPUS - PARENT

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Number of Questionnaires Distributed		60	60
Number of Questionnaires Returned		25	34
Percentage of Return		41.6	56.6
The responses to the questions are expressed in terms of percentages.			
Self-discipline:			
1. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for self-discipline?	1. Not at all	20.0	6.3
	2. Very little	52.0	12.5
	3. Considerably more	20.0	50.0
	4. Completely	8.0	25.0
	NA	0	6.2
2. To what extent does the student body apply this concept of self-discipline?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	20.0	15.6
	3. Considerably more	32.0	37.5
	4. Completely	8.0	25.0
	NA	0	6.2
3. To what extent does the open campus policy provide opportunities for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time?	1. Not at all	4.0	0
	2. Very little	16.0	3.3
	3. Considerably more	40.0	43.3
	4. Completely	40.0	50.0
	NA	0	3.4

Appendix H (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Academic matters:			
4. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement?	1. Not at all	12.0	6.3
	2. Very little	28.0	31.2
	3. Considerably more	36.0	31.2
	4. Completely	12.0	6.3
	NA	12.0	25.0
5. To what extent may a student receive extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	3.2
	2. Very little	16.7	9.3
	3. Considerably more	45.8	53.1
	4. Completely	20.8	15.6
	NA	16.7	18.8
6. To what extent does the student take advantage of getting extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	4.0	6.2
	2. Very little	20.0	37.5
	3. Considerably more	48.0	34.4
	4. Completely	8.0	9.4
	NA	20.0	12.5
Extra counseling:			
7. To what extent may a student receive extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	20.0	12.6
	3. Considerably more	52.0	43.7
	4. Completely	8.0	18.7
	NA	20.0	25.0
8. To what extent does the student take advantage of the opportunity for extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	9.4
	2. Very little	36.0	21.9
	3. Considerably more	28.0	25.0
	4. Completely	4.0	9.4
	NA	32.0	34.3

Appendix H (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Human relations:			
9. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	4.0	9.4
	2. Very little	16.0	15.6
	3. Considerably more	36.0	43.7
	4. Completely	36.0	21.9
	NA	8.0	9.4
10. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	4.0	3.2
	2. Very little	16.0	21.9
	3. Considerably more	32.0	46.9
	4. Completely	12.0	9.3
	NA	36.0	18.7
Attendance:			
11. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance?	1. Not at all	4.0	9.3
	2. Very little	12.0	12.6
	3. Considerably more	20.0	21.9
	4. Completely	16.0	9.4
	NA	48.0	46.8
Vandalism:			
12. To what extent has the open campus policy and resultant use of non-classroom areas by students led to an increase in vandalism?	1. Not at all	8.0	15.6
	2. Very little	36.0	12.6
	3. Considerably more	4.0	15.6
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	52.0	56.2

APPENDIX I

COMPARATIVE RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES ON OPEN CAMPUS - TEACHER

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Number of Questionnaires Distributed		20	20
Number of Questionnaires Returned		13	17
Percentage of Return		65	85
The responses to the questions are expressed in terms of percentages.			
Self-discipline:			
1. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for self-discipline	1. Not at all	0	5.9
	2. Very little	23.1	23.5
	3. Considerably more	53.8	53.0
	4. Completely	15.4	17.6
	NA	7.7	0
2. To what extent does the student body apply this concept of self-discipline?	1. Not at all	7.7	17.6
	2. Very little	53.8	41.2
	3. Considerably more	38.5	41.2
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	0	0
3. To what extent does the open campus policy provide opportunities for students to make significant decisions about the use of unassigned time?	1. Not at all	7.7	0
	2. Very little	7.7	17.6
	3. Considerably more	38.5	41.2
	4. Completely	46.1	41.2
	NA	0	0

Appendix I (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Academic matters:			
4. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered an atmosphere conducive to better academic achievement?	1. Not at all	7.7	11.8
	2. Very little	69.2	29.4
	3. Considerably more	23.1	52.9
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	0	5.9
5. To what extent may a student receive extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	15.4	5.9
	3. Considerably more	69.2	64.7
	4. Completely	15.4	29.4
	NA	0	0
6. To what extent does the student take advantage of getting extra help in a subject under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	69.2	41.2
	3. Considerably more	30.8	58.8
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	0	0
Extra Counseling:			
7. To what extent may a student receive extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	23.1	5.9
	3. Considerably more	38.5	58.9
	4. Completely	23.1	17.6
	NA	15.3	17.6
8. To what extent does the student take advantage of the opportunity for extra counseling under the open campus policy?	1. Not at all	0	0
	2. Very little	53.8	23.5
	3. Considerably more	15.4	47.1
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	30.8	29.4

Appendix I (continued)

		1st Sem.	2nd Sem.
Human relations:			
9. To what extent does the open campus policy provide for the possibility of a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	0	5.9
	2. Very little	15.4	29.4
	3. Considerably more	46.1	35.3
	4. Completely	38.5	29.4
	NA	0	0
10. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered a positive climate of human relations?	1. Not at all	0	11.8
	2. Very little	23.1	23.4
	3. Considerably more	69.2	58.9
	4. Completely	0	5.9
	NA	7.7	0
Attendance:			
11. To what extent has the open campus policy fostered desirable rates of class attendance?	1. Not at all	38.5	17.6
	2. Very little	15.3	35.3
	3. Considerably more	30.8	47.1
	4. Completely	0	0
	NA	15.4	0
Vandalism:			
12. To what extent has the open campus policy and resultant use of non-classroom areas by students led to an increase in vandalism?	1. Not at all	7.7	0
	2. Very little	46.1	37.5
	3. Considerably more	30.8	37.5
	4. Completely	7.7	12.5
	NA	7.7	12.5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coffin, Gregory C., "The Open Campus, and How It Swept Massachusetts", Education Summary, 3, April, 1972.

Cotton, Oscar, "Open Campus High Schools: Principals' Perceptions and Practices in the State of Connecticut", Dissertation Abstracts International, May, 1973.

Cotton, Oscar, "Some Implications of the Open Campus Design", APSS Know How, 24, 1972.

Department of Education, Instructions for School Attendance, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1973.

Department of Education, School Attendance Regulations, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1974.

Gibson, John S., Evaluation of the 1971-1972 Boston High School Flexible Campus Program, Medford, Massachusetts, The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, 1972.

Graslie, Louis, "Five Years of Open Campus", NASSP Bulletin, 369, Reston, Virginia, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1973.

Harriton High School, Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures, Rosemont, Pennsylvania, 1975-1976.

Harriton High School, Student Guide, Rosemont, Pennsylvania, 1975-1976.

Mickey, Donald L. and Bryon, Lawrence E., An Evaluation of the Open Campus Policy at Interlake Senior High School, Washington, Bellevue Public Schools, 1972.

National Association of Secondary School Principals, "Student Attendance and Absenteeism", The Practitioner, 1, Reston Virginia, Research Department of NASSP, March, 1975.

Roth, Robert, "A Systematic Evaluation of the Self-directed Day at Niles East High School, Skokie, Illinois", Dissertation Abstracts International, December, 1971.